

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DOCKET & FILE
NOT FOR PUBLICATION

-----X
RAFAEL URENA,

Petitioner,

MEMORANDUM and ORDER

-against-

07-CV-548 (SLT) (CLP)

WILLIAM R. LAPE,

Respondent.

-----X
TOWNES, United States District Judge:

FILED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.
★ JUN 06 2007
P.M.
TIME A.M. (9)

In a Memorandum and Order dated May 2, 2007, this Court denied Petitioner Rafael Urena's motion for appointment of counsel and, in light of Petitioner's *pro se* status, extended his time to file his reply papers to June 15, 2007. By letter dated May 27, 2007, petitioner now requests that this Court (1) reconsider its denial of his motion for appointment of counsel and (2) further extend petitioner's time to file his reply papers to July 15, 2007. Petitioner's letter explains that he is having trouble obtaining access to the prison law library and is seeking assistance from "various agencies," but does not suggest that there are either facts or cases which this Court might have overlooked in its prior Memorandum and Order.


"The standard for granting . . . a motion [for reconsideration] is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked – matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court." *Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995) (citing cases). While this Court recognizes that *pro se* submissions must be held "to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers," *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972) (per curiam), *pro se* litigants are not "exempt . . . from compliance with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law." *Traguth v. Zuck*, 710 F.2d 90, 95 (2d Cir. 1983).

Petitioner's May 27, 2007, letter does not state a basis for reconsideration. It does not suggest that there is any relevant point of law or fact which this Court might have overlooked. Accordingly, petitioner's motion for reconsideration is denied. However, in light of petitioner's representations that he is having difficulty accessing the prison law library and that he is seeking the assistance of "various agencies," this Court will grant petitioner's request for an extension of time to file his reply papers.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner's request for reconsideration of this Court's May 2, 2007, Memorandum and Order denying his motion for appointment of counsel is hereby denied. Petitioner's time to file his reply papers is extended up to and including July 16, 2007.

SO ORDERED.


SANDRA L. TOWNES
United States District Judge

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
June 5, 2007